



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|

08/764,560 12/12/96 KAKUTA

J 1083.1027/JD

021171  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
700 11TH STREET, NW  
SUITE 500  
WASHINGTON DC 20001

TM02/1105

EXAMINER

HUVNHN, C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176  
DATE MAILED:

11/05/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

|                              |                                      |                                      |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | Application No.<br><b>08/764,560</b> | Applicant(s)<br><b>Kakuta et al.</b> |
|                              | Examiner<br><b>Cong-Lac Huynh</b>    | Art Unit<br><b>2176</b>              |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 13, 2001.
- 2a)  This action is FINAL.      2b)  This action is non-final.
- 3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4)  Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6)  Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8)  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11)  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a)  approved b)  disapproved.
- 12)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a)  All b)  Some\* c)  None of:

1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

#### Attachment(s)

- 15)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)      18)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 16)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)      19)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_      20)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2176

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed on 08/13/01 for the application filed on 12/12/96.
2. Claim 27 is added.
3. Claims 1-27 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 17, 21, 25, 26, and 27 are independent claims.
4. The rejections of claims 1-3, 17-18, 21-22, 25-26 under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Nakajima et al. (5,659,791) in view of Khoyi et al. (5,421,015). have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.
5. The rejections of claims 1-3, 17-18, 21-22, 25-26 under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Nakajima et al. (5,659,791) in view of Khoyi et al. (5,421,015). have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.
6. The rejections of claims 4-12, 16, 19-20, 23-24 under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Nakajima and Khoyi and further in view of Person have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.
7. The rejections of claims 13-15 under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Nakajima, Khoyi, Person and further in view of Microsoft have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Art Unit: 2176

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103 (c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 1-3, 17-18, 21-22, 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima et al. (US Pat No. 5,659,791, 8/19/97) and Khoyi et al. (US Pat No. 5,421,015) in view of Convington et al. (US Pat No. 5,524,193, 6/4/96).

With respect to independent claim 17, Nakajima discloses:

Art Unit: 2176

--the obtaining information from the external application program in accordance with the result of the analysis (the scrap object is integrated into a destination document or transferred between applications via a clipboard after the information is selected to be extracted from the document (col 2, lines 20-43; col 1, lines 46-61))

--the creating an information object in accordance with the obtained information and attribute information which includes object ID, object type and information type (the encapsulating of the selected information into an object is created automatically by the system to encapsulate the selected information in response to the extracting and that is stored in the memory (col 6, lines 25-28); an object is a combination of data structure that hold *attribute data* and *functions that act upon the attribute data* (col 5, lines 64-67); the giving of a name for an object for *referencing the object* (col 6, lines 64-67), which means each object has an ID; the *recognizing of the information type to handle the reintegration of an object* (col 5, lines 55-58))

Nakajima does not disclose the priority for showing of objects, time stamp, object link which are able to be modified after being created as an information object.

Khoyi discloses:

- the object catalog including the object table and link table (figure 5)
- the object table includes object identifiers, object type and object location (figure 6)
- the link table includes link ID, link type, parent object identifiers, child object identifiers (figure 7)
- the linking of data objects (col 3, lines 12-20; col 43, lines 1-11)

Art Unit: 2176

-- the ability of editing of the moved or copied objects (col 43, lines 66-67; col 44, lines 1-5)

-- the changing the manner of drawing the information object on the basis of the attribute information (col 3, lines 22-36)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Khoyi into Nakajima to have the information objects, for user selecting of information, which include object ID, object type, object link and the ability of modifying objects after created. As disclosed, the attribute information includes object ID, object type and object link, parent object ID and child object ID which are object ID of next object, thus motivating the including of the priority for showing and time stamp, which are other information data related to the object.

In addition, the fact that Nakajima shows that the information is selected as requested, transferred and integrated into a document of another application implies that the system can analyze an event for selecting information as well as create an information object as desired.

*Khoyi also discloses that a new object is created at will by a user by modifying the object prototype in the object prototype table to change the characteristics of the object (col 3, lines 37-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have recognized that when the characteristics of an object is changed, the appearance of the object should be changed. In other words, the appearance of the selected object is different from the non-selected object.*

Art Unit: 2176

Nakajima and Khoyi do not disclose *a transparent window* through which contents of the information controlled by the external application program is seen.

Covington discloses a window which includes information of a portion of a document and that window overlays over the window of the document (figures 1 and 2, the selected information Hyades is created as an object and is disclosed on the small window overlaying over the window of the document, and the content of the document can be seen).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have recognized that in Covington the window that includes the portion of the document is *transparent* since the content of the document beneath that window can be seen.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Covington into Nakajima and Khoyi to provide an effective method using a separate window displaying the selected portion of a document for easily viewing and editing documents.

With respect to claim 18, which is dependent on claim 17, Nakajima discloses that the information is selected to be extracted from the document and transferred to a clipboard provided in the operating system using the scrap object. The selected information then is transferred from the clipboard to an application (col 1, lines 55-62). Nakajima also discloses that after the scrap object is created, it may be subsequently integrated into a document, including the document from which it originated (col 4, lines 53-56).

Art Unit: 2176

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have applied Nakajima because Nakajama provides the clipboard for transferring selected information between applications which include the original application and the application different from the original application.

Claim 21 is for a computer readable program code to perform the steps in claim 17, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 2 and 3 are the system for performing the step in claim 18, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 22 is the program code means for performing the step in claim 18, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With respect to independent claim 1, Nakajima discloses, as in claim 17, the information is selected, transferred and integrated into another document using a scrap object as a vehicle for interapplication transfer of information (col 3, lines 25-35). Nakajima also discloses the operating system provides code for a clipboard and code for implementing a user interface (col 2, lines 55-60). Nakajima further discloses the role of the mouse and the operating system in the drag-and-drop mechanism used to create a scrap object in which the movement of the mouse, the

Art Unit: 2176

depression and the release of the mouse button, each constitutes an event that is translated by the operating system into a message, and the operating system post most of the mouse messages into a message queue for a currently executing application program (col 3, lines 25-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have employed Nakajima because Nakajima shows the abilities of selecting, transferring and integrating information between applications in which the operating system plays an important role in incorporating with the mouse to translate events entered into messages to execute the requests to the applications.

Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Khoyi into Nakajima since Khoyi provides the link feature and the ability of editing of copied data as mentioned in claim 17 above.

In addition, as in claim 17, Khoyi *also discloses that a new object is created at will by a user by modifying the object prototype in the object prototype table to change the characteristics of the object* (col 3, lines 37-48). *It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have recognized that when the characteristics of an object is changed, the appearance of the object should be changed. In other words, the appearance of the selected object is different from the non-selected object.*

Art Unit: 2176

Independent claim 25 includes part of limitations of claims 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Independent claim 26 is for the computer-readable program code for the method claim 25, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Independent claim 27 includes limitations disclosed in claim 1, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

11. Claims 4-12, 16, 19-20, 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima, Khoyi, and Covington as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Person (*Using Windows 3.1*, 1993).

With respect to claim 19, which is dependent on claim 17, Nakajima, Khoyi, and Covington do not disclose the editing of the contents of the selected information objects after created.

Person discloses the editing the contents of the embedded objects in a document (p.235, 236, 521, 522).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated Person to Nakajima because Nakajama shows the transferring selected information objects and Person shows the editing the selected information objected after created.

Art Unit: 2176

With respect to claim 20, which is dependent on claim 17, it was well known that a user can (a) move an object from one location to another by using the drag-and-drop mechanism, (b) delete an object by highlighting the object and pressing the delete key, (c ) change an object by highlighting a portion of the object and pressing the delete key to remove that portion, (d) to create a new information object by selecting a portion of an object and save It under a different name. In addition, Nakajima shows the combining objects when a scrap object integrated into another object of other document. Nakajima also discloses the class object that refers to a group of objects thus all scrap objects belong to the scrap object class have the same type of attributes and functions (col 3, lines 1-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have applied Nakajima along with the conventional features of a document processing system to perform the functions as claimed.

Claim 23 is a computer program code means to perform the functions of claim 19, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 24 is a computer program code means to perform the functions of claim 20, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 4-10 are for the means included in the system to perform the functions disclosed in claim 20, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2176

With respect to claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, It was well known when a selected text or graphics is moved, the rest of the document is moved to maintain the relative location in the document.

With respect to claim 12, which is dependent on claim 10, the fact that a file subdirectory containing a plurality of files including the index file, if the index files is selected and deleted, the whole subdirectory is deleted, can be applied to the object group as claimed.

With respect to claim 16, which is dependent on claim 10, Nakajima does not disclose that an information object belonging to any one of information object groups and an information object which does not belong to any information object group are shown on the window by different ways. Person discloses the document including the information selected from different applications. The display of the whole document is different from the display of only the information from Microsoft Excel which are the graph and the table (page 208). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have applied Person to Nakajima because Person shows the display of the combined document, including text and graphics, which is different from the document from Excel which includes only the graph and table.

Art Unit: 2176

12. Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima, Khoyi, Covington, and Person as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Microsoft (*Microsoft Windows User's Guide*, 1992).

With respect to claim 13, which is dependent on claim 10, Nakajima, Khoyi and Person do not disclose the relationship of an information object in the information object group, when selected, is canceled.

Microsoft discloses that when deleting a link from an Cardfile object embedded in a Write document, both the link to the drawing and the drawing are removed from the document (p. 502).

With respect to claims 14 and 15, when two objects are selected and grouped, there is a hierarchical relationship created between the two elements in the group and, it was well known that if one element is selected and deleted, it is removed from the document.

#### *Response to Arguments*

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicants argue that none of the cited references disclose *a transparent window* through which contents of the information controlled by the external application program is seen.

Art Unit: 2176

Examiner agrees.

To support that feature, Applicants point out that the transparent window is disclosed in the specification (page 35, lines 22 to page 36, lines 18). However, Examiner does not see anything *in that portion of specification* that supports the transparent window as explained in the remark. Instead, this portion discloses the function buttons on an user interface (only one window) that allow a user to edit a document.

Covington, cited in combination with Nakajima and Khoyi, discloses a window which includes information of a portion of a document and that window overlays over the window of the document (figures 1 and 2, the selected information Hyades is created as an object and is disclosed on the small window overlaying over the window of the document, and the content of the document can be seen).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have recognized that in Covington the window that includes the portion of the document is *transparent* since the content of the document beneath that window can be seen.

Independent claims 17, 21, 25-27, and dependent claims 18 and 22 have been amended to recite similar features, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 4-16, 19-20, 23-24 are rejected as being dependent on claims 1, 17, and 21 above.

Art Unit: 2176

***Conclusion***

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Zhu (US PaT No. 5,577,188, 11/19/96, filed 5/31/94).

Drews et al. (US Pat No. 5,568,607, 6/16/98, filed 4/30/96).

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong Lac Huynh whose telephone number is (703) 305-0432. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

Art Unit: 2176

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax number to this Art Unit is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

**17. Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 746-7239, (for formal communications intended for entry)

**Or:**

(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label  
“PROPOSED” or “DRAFT”)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,  
Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

clh

10/29/01

  
**STEPHEN S. HONG**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**